

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashimoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,645) in view of Yamauchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,202).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants propose to amend claim 1 by this amendment. Claims 1-20 remain currently pending with claims 1-4 under consideration.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashimoto in view of Yamauchi et al. To the extent that this rejection might be applied to the claims, as newly-amended, it is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kashimoto and Yamauchi et al., whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1, as newly-amended. For instance, it is respectfully submitted that Kashimoto and Yamauchi et al., whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in claim 1, as newly-amended, including at least “a light-shielding layer in the pad and active regions except the sealing region on the second substrate, a portion of the light-shielding layer that is in the pad region of the second substrate being located directly above the pad region of the first substrate having one of the gate and data lines extended thereto.”

The Final Office Action acknowledges that Kashimoto does not disclose a light shielding layer in a pad region. See, for example, page 3, line 6 of the Final Office Action. Thus, the Final Office Action cites Yamauchi et al. as allegedly remedying the deficiencies of Kashimoto in this regard.

However, in contrast to Applicants' claimed combination as a whole, Yamauchi et al. instead discloses a light interceptive member (10, 11, 12 or 13) surrounding ICs (130 or 140), which are overhanging from a top substrate (112). See, for example, Figs. 5 and 6 of Yamauchi et al. Thus, none of Yamauchi et al.'s light interceptive members (10, 11, 12 and 13) are directly above a pad region of a bottom substrate (117). In fact, the light interceptive members (10, 11 or 12), which are formed on a top surface of the top substrate (112), are not directly above the bottom substrate (117) at all. See, for example, Figs. 5 and 6 of Yamauchi et al. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the light interceptive members, as taught by Yamauchi et al., are not the light shielding layer in the pad region, as set forth in Applicants' claimed combinations.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kashimoto and Yamauchi et al., whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in claim 1, as newly-amended including at least "a light-shielding layer in the pad and active regions except the sealing region on the second substrate, a portion of the light-shielding layer that is in the pad region of the second substrate being located directly above the pad region of the first substrate having one of the gate and data lines extended thereto." Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that since Kashimoto and Yamauchi et al., whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every feature of independent claim 1, Kashimoto in view of Yamauchi et al. does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

**The Final Office Action overlooks Applicants' traversal of the Office's assertion that the use of UV-type hardening material for the sealing element is common and well known**

Further, at least since claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Kashimoto in view of Yamauchi et al. also does not render claims 2-4 unpatentable. In addition,

these applied references also fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 2-4. For instance, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Kashimoto nor Yamauchi et al. teaches or suggests the UV hardening sealant, as set forth in claim 2. The Final Office Action states that UV-type hardening material used for the sealing element is common and known in the liquid crystal display art. See page 3, lines 1-2 of the Final Office Action.

The Final Office Action asserts at page 4, lines 5-6 that “Applicant has not challenged that the use of UV-type hardening material for the sealing element is not common and known in the liquid crystal display art.” However, as stated in the Amendment filed on February 10, 2004, for example, at page 6, lines 7-10, “Applicants respectfully traverse the Office Action’s assertion and request that evidence be provided in accordance with M.P.E.P. §2144.03. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that thermo-hardening material and not UV hardening sealant is generally used for the sealing element in the liquid crystal display art.”

In any event, Applicants, once again, respectfully traverse and respectfully challenge the Final Office Action’s assertion of the use of UV-type hardening material for the sealing element as common and known in the liquid crystal display art and respectfully request that evidence be provided in accordance with M.P.E.P. §2144.03 if the rejections are to be maintained.

In light of the above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: September 7, 2004

By:

  
Victoria D. Hao

Registration No. 47,630

**Customer No.: 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001